

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 15,--NO. 45.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1860.

WHOLE NO. 767.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

KANSAS REMINISCENCES.

[A correspondent of the Boston Journal, who is now travelling in Kansas, relates a few incidents of the past, which are interesting.]

The 'creeks' around Holton were settled by Missourians, who for a time maintained the ascendancy. In March, 1859, the proceedings of the first Republican convention ever held here were interrupted by a party of intoxicated pro-slavery men. After the meeting adjourned, several of the ruffians fell upon the secretary, who was quietly leaving the room, and knocked him down. They also assaulted another Republican and fired four shots at him while he was senseless upon the ground. This was after nearly all the Republicans had left the vicinity of the hall, but they were suddenly called back by the cry of 'God for God's sake, guns! Shall we see our friends murdered?' These starting words were passed from mouth to mouth, and in a few seconds there was a dozen Republicans on the ground, and their assailants were flying in all directions with bullets whistling about their heads. Four of them were shot, and though none of them were fatally wounded, one of the miscreants still carries a ball in his cheek, which entered on the opposite side and passed nearly through his face. This was a style of reasoning—a sort of argument *ad hominem*—which the Missourians appreciated; and its logic proved entirely convincing for they have been extremely civil ever since.

From Holton my course was still Northward, and after dark I stopped at a small log house to enquire if I could obtain lodgings.

'Don't know your name sir,' replied the settler, looking searchingly at me from the door, as he threw the light of his candle full in my face. 'A slightly built, closely shaven man of unmistakably Yankee features, his vigilant eye had evidently seen something of the war, and was on the look-out for surprises. On learning circumstantially who I was he welcomed me cordially to his humble home. After ascertaining that he was a participant in the rencounter mentioned above, and had been shot at from ambush on one or two occasions I did not wonder at his wariness. His wife—like myself, a native of Connecticut—was a young lady of superior intelligence and culture. They located here three years ago, and for the first six weeks, after their arrival she did not meet a single woman. She has since seen something of the rough edges of life, vastly different from her New England home, but her contentment had robbed the pioneer hardships of half their terrors.

'Were you acquainted with old John Brown?' asked my host during the evening.

'Not personally.'

'He was in this house for four days winter before last, waiting for the creek to fall, so that he could go on with a party of twelve negroes whom he was taking to Canada.'

'How many men were with him?'

'None but Stevens and Whipple.'

'How did he impress you?'

'As a man of perfect sincerity and rectitude, governed by Christian principles. He was very quiet, and correct in his language, and no one could utter an oath in his presence without a reproof either of language or look.'

'Did he say anything foreshadowing the Harper's Ferry affair?'

'Not a word.'

'Stevens,' continued the wife, 'was a daring fellow. One day a party of six men from Leecompton came prowling around here in a suspicious manner. At last Stevens lost all patience and taking his Sharp's rifle, went down to the creek where they were consulting.

'What are you looking for?' he inquired.

'Six runaway niggers.'

'They described them to him, and he found they were not the ones we had.

'Well gentlemen,' said he, 'we haven't got your negroes, but we have got twelve others up at the house. Come and see them if you like.'

'They were taken all shack by his coolness, and rode with him up to the house. Then he suddenly drew his rifle on them and cocked it, exclaiming, 'I'll teach you to come here hunting negroes.'

'They were all armed to the teeth, but five of them rode away at full speed, leaving the sixth, who was covered with the rifle and dare not budge an inch. 'Get off your horse,' said Stevens. The man did so. 'Now give up your arms.' The poor fellow was frightened almost to death and gave up his revolver. Stevens then marched him into the house and said, 'Mr. Brown here is a man who came up here hunting negroes. Do what you please with him. Mr. Brown examined him to see that he had no more weapons, took a rope from his pocket and tied his hands and feet and then asked him to sit down! He kept that man a prisoner here during all the time he staid, and talked to him about slavery and the meanness of hunting fugitives. When at last he let him go he seemed thoroughly converted. He told me after he was set at liberty that he was surprised not to find old John Brown a brawny, blood-thirsty villain, but a good honest man, and that he would walk on his hands and knees from here to Holton to preserve him from harm! I don't believe that he has been out after runaway slaves since or ever will again.'

'There was a fresh instance of the wonderful power of the Old Man in impressing even enemies with his perfect rectitude and sincerity. It was to this house that Marshal Wood of Leecompton came with a posse of thirty men to arrest John Brown. The officers remained near the premises, though out of pistol shot, for several hours, but were in mortal terror of Brown and his associates. The Marshal (who was quite as badly frightened as any of them) endeavoring in vain to inspire his posse with courage to enter the house, where Stevens, Whipple and Brown, with cocked revolvers and rifles were waiting to receive them. The sight of Stevens, with rifle leveled, exclaiming cheerfully, 'Come on gentlemen, we are ready whenever you are,' was quite too much for their nerves; they were finally persuaded that

the little cabin and the hay loft swarmed with armed men, and at last they departed in tumultuous haste, leaving John Brown and his negroes to go on out of the Territory, in broad daylight, by the most traveled road.

When we sat down to breakfast the next morning my host devoutly asked a blessing upon the meal. A few minutes later, in conversation, he coolly remarked: 'I should not be sorry to see the troubles break out again. I know of a few soundreels who have harassed the Free State men beyond all endurance, and who ought to be killed; but of course we don't want to shoot them unless they again give us just provocation.'

Soon after he sought his corn field, and your correspondent continued his way towards Brown county.

NO MORE SLAVE STATES.

'For ourselves, we are sorry that the hosts of freedom could not have been led forth upon a higher platform, and have inscribed upon their banners, "Death to Slavery," instead of "No more Slave States!" But the people will not have it so, and we are compelled to work and wait for a brighter day, when the masses shall be educated up to a higher standard of human rights and political morality.'—*Frederick Douglass Paper.*

The Editor, whoever he may be, that penned the above, (Mr. Douglass is in Europe), appears to be behind the times. No party exists that, instead of inscribing on its banners, "Death to Slavery," inscribes "No more Slave States!" There was once such a party. It was called the "Free Soil party." It was organized in 1848, and remained in the field just four years, when it became tired of the hated name, and exchanged it for "Free Democracy." In 1852, in form, it retained, we think the old creed, but the expositions of it by its leaders, grew fainter and fainter between, until 1856, when "Free Democracy," gave place for "a broader platform," under the name of the Republican party, by the action of two successive Conventions, the first at Pittsburgh, the second at Philadelphia. The Platform adopted at Pittsburgh, was from the pen of Henry J. Raymond of the *New York Times*. A correspondent of the *N. Y. Tribune* reported that one of the Western delegates proposed to amend the draft, by inserting the motto of "No more slave States," or its equivalent, but found only six delegates present, himself included, in favor of its insertion. Letters from leading politicians in Congress, had earnestly counselled the dropping of the "Free Soil" issue. Certain it is, that the Pittsburgh Platform did not contain it, and that, although a new draft was presented and adopted as a Platform, at Philadelphia, containing the glittering generalities of the Declaration of Independence, yet special care was taken to restrict their application to "the Territories," ignoring "the States," whether new or old, for whose benefit, and by the action of those of them then existing, the Federal Constitution had been formed. The motto of "No more slave States," has never been in the Republican Platform, and has been continuously and uniformly disclaimed by the leaders of the Republican party, in and out of Congress, and accompanied in hundreds of instances, in print, with charges of mendacity against Democratic leaders, for charging it upon the Republican party. It is true that professions of opposition to "the further extension of slavery" have been as constantly upon the lips and pens of leading Republicans, all along, but when pressed for explanations or specifications, the uniform result has been that the exclusion of slavery from the Territories while remaining such, is all that was proposed, while as Mr. Lincoln, the new Presidential candidate has expressed it, the new State that presents itself for admission with a pro-slavery Constitution, must necessarily be received into the Union. The new platform adopted at Chicago, without ambiguity, takes substantially the same ground, by distinctly recognizing the right of "the States," (making no distinction between old States and new,) to regulate their domestic institutions as they please. Such, is now, the admitted logical necessity, so long as the right of the old States to retain slavery is recognized instead of demanding "Death to slavery," instead.

More than all this may be affirmed. Since the vote of the Republican Representatives in Congress, on the Crittenden Leecompton Kansas Bill, (a measure recommended in advance of Mr. Crittenden and Mr. Montgomery, by the *N. Y. Tribune*), the doctrine of a Congressional national exclusion of slavery from the Territories, has been but feebly, faintly and hesitatingly re-affirmed by many of the Republican leaders. Some of them, we know, when closely questioned and looked square in the eye, cannot meet the eye of the questioner, and say that they really expect the adoption of any such measure. A very large portion of intelligent and candid Republicans will tell you, if questioned, that their minds have undergone a great change, within four years past, on that subject, that the effort to exclude slavery from the Territories by Federal action, while slavery is permitted in the States, is a failure, and must be. Large numbers of them avow the doctrine of popular sovereignty in the territories, as held by Douglas, to be the true doctrine. The late Republican State Convention of Connecticut, placed itself distinctly upon that doctrine, and their having done so carried the State for the Republicans, a victory triumphantly heralded by the Republican press all over the country. The popularity of Douglas and of his doctrine, among Republicans, is such that the Republican leaders dread nothing so much as a harmonious nomination of him, by the Democracy, on that Platform. Could Mr. Greeley have succeeded in persuading the Republicans of Illinois to support Douglas for U. S. Senator, instead of running Lincoln, it is by no means impossible that the former instead of the latter, would have been the Republican nominee at Chicago, in harmony with the Douglas Democratic Convention, to be held at Baltimore. The same policy that dictated the conciliation of the Germans at the expense of losing their old allies, the Native Americans, would have suggested it. We know indeed, that—as it was—the policy was under grave consideration, among some Republicans.

Eli Thayer, the popular Republican Representative in Congress from Massachusetts—not alone in the movement—has already proposed a general law for the government of all Territories of the United States, authorizing the settlers to admit or exclude slavery, as they please. Thus feeble and unsteady is the hold of the Republican party of 1860, upon the doctrine of a Federal exclusion of slavery from the Territories. Were it possible to make up an issue with the Douglas Democrats without it, there would probably have been as little hesitancy at throwing it overboard at Chicago, as there was in throwing overboard the issue of "No more slave States," at Pittsburgh and at Philadelphia.

Such are the records of our past history; and such, as we understand them, are the facts of today. It is not best to forget, to ignore, or to misstate them.

Of the policy and ethics of co-operating with the opponents of correct principles to-day, as a means of 'educating them up to a higher standard of human rights, and political morality,' to-morrow, we have not time or space to say much at present. Nor does it seem needful. The writer who proposes it in Frederick Douglass' paper, unless we mistake his identity, has depressed, instead of elevating, or even retaining his own former ethical and political standard in the very fact of proposing it. The educating effects of the policy he commends, is seen in the downward course we have already described.

SENATOR SUMNER'S GREAT SPEECH.

The venomous abolition speech of Charles Sumner, in the Senate to-day, drew to the galleries of that body a large and fashionable audience, and the extraordinary character of his language was well calculated to retain his hearers to the end. With the full, resounding voice of an operatic basso profundo, with the accomplishments of a scholar, the air and graces of the learned traveler, and the style and action of the professional orator, Mr. Sumner combines the advantages of a splendid physical man, six feet three, a poet's imagination, and the zeal of a fanatic.

It was four years ago on the 20th of May last, if we are not mistaken, that Mr. Sumner was so solemnly assailed and beaten at his post in the Senate chamber, and that his injuries have required most of the intervening four years to restore him to something like his wonted health and strength. But through all this interval, as it was shown in his speech to-day, that implacable, fanatical hatred of the peculiar institutions of the South, which dictated his speech in 1856 on 'the crime against Kansas,' has been diffusing itself throughout his entire mental organization, like the poison of a malignant disease, until, like William Lloyd Garrison, Owen Lovejoy, and John Brown, he can see nothing but the horrors of slavery, and recognizes nothing but the duty of its extermination. It was painful, in the face of this conviction, to contemplate the warping and dwarfing of this naturally genial, comprehensive and cultivated mind of Sumner to this 'one idea' of the 'irrepressible conflict,' against the fixed domestic institutions of one half this great confederacy, utterly regardless of the binding obligations of the Constitution in the relations of the citizens of each State with their brethren of all the other States.

But the peculiar venom of Mr. Sumner against slavery and "the barbarians of slavery" is due to the same general cause which changed Garrison, Lovejoy, Brown and Helper from reasoning philanthropists to blind and revengeful fanatics. Garrison became the vindictive fanatic from the day that he suffered from the hands of a Boston mob; Lovejoy began to live only for his great revenge against the "slave power" from the day that his brother, the publisher of an abolition paper in Illinois, was sacrificed in an effort to repulse by arms the attack of a Missouri mob upon his establishment; John Brown's fatal fray upon Harper's Ferry is charged to the wrongs which he suffered from the border ruffians of Kansas; Helper was incensed to the publication of his infamous book by some injuries, real or fancied, from the people of North Carolina; and Sumner's inspiration is manifestly the bludgeon of Brooks.

Yet all this class of men are detected in the vanguard of the Republican party, and we have no doubt that the leaders of the Republican camp in and out of Congress, will be as prompt and liberal in their endorsements of and subscriptions for this revolutionary harangue of Sumner as they were to assist in the circulation of the treasonable and bloody instructions of Helper. We shall see. If anything can operate to cure the madness which has seized upon our Democratic politicians, and bring them to a sense of their duty, it will be the warning voice of this terrible revolutionary speech of Sumner. It fully exposes and urges the manifest destiny of the 'irrepressible conflict,' disunion, revolution and civil strife. It rejects all counsels of fraternity, peace and harmony, and it could not be more violent against our brethren of the Southern States were they already arrayed against the North as a hostile people in the attitude of war.

During the delivery of this exasperating bill of charges, specifications and denunciations of that "sum of all villainies,"—slavery—a profound and most ominous silence prevailed on the floor of the Senate, and in the galleries. We have no recollection, in our experience here, running through a period of twenty years, of anything like this ominous silence, during the delivery of a speech for buncombe on slavery, by a Northern fanatic or Southern fire eater. We say ominous silence, because we can only recognize it as something fearful ominous—ominous of mischief, ominous of the revival in the Capitol, and throughout the country of the slavery agitation, with a tenfold bitterness compared with any previous stirring up of the fountain of bitter waters.

The only thing approaching an audible expression from Senator or citizen during this fearful speech was an 'irrepressible' little outbreak of laughter on the democratic side, in the allusion of the orator to the reward offered by some wicked wag in Virginia, during the John Brown excitement, of fifty thousand dollars for the living embodiment of one W. H. Seward. In fact, there

was so much of sensation matter, so much of the stuff of the 'Pirates' Own Book,' the 'Newgate Calendar,' and books of that exciting description, bottled into this speech of Sumner, that one must conclude that all his spare time of these last four years has been devoted to the compilation of this chapter of horrible things.

We leave him in the midst of his work, to close for the mail, the uppermost idea suggested from what we have heard being, a presentiment that this extraordinary and fearful delivery of the deep revenge of Mr. Sumner against slavery can only result, and will surely result, in more mischief against the country than a thousand Sumners can repair in a lifetime.

SENATOR SUMNER'S GREAT SPEECH.

The greatest speech of the season is certainly Charles Sumner's magnificent philippic against 'The Great Barbarism.' The learning and research, the array of facts, the apt and eloquent quotations, the striking illustrations, and the vivid imagery of the oration, are its least merits. The style and diction are as clear as crystal, as pure as water, and sonorously musical. The entire tone of the speech is dignified and lofty—it is an overwhelming exposure and rebuke of what he conceives to be a gigantic and horrible wrong. Its facts, its figures, and its arguments strike the Proslaveryites dumb; and they can only relieve themselves by impotent abuse of the orator himself.

It is possible that this speech may have been ill-timed, for it is not always expedient to speak the whole truth. It is possible that it does not make sufficient allowance for the noble qualities of the Southern people in other regards than Slavery. But why bark at the heels of Charles Sumner? If any man in the world has a perfect right to defy and denounce slavery that man is Charles Sumner. If any man in the world has a perfect right to lay bare the hellish horrors of 'chattel' slavery, and to expose its barbarous effects upon slave masters, that man is Charles Sumner.

Indeed we admire his courage, his unequalled moral pluck. In this day of compromise and timidity, of luted breath and base concession, when it is the last name fashion to say that the slavery question should be discussed only as a matter of profit and loss, it is refreshing to hear a Senator speak in the spirit of Jefferson and the Fathers. Besides, does not the South challenge us to discuss the abstract question? Do not Benjamin, Toombs, Stephens, Corry, Keith, Lamar, Hunter, Sidel, Brown, Hammond, Chesnut, Mason, Pryor, Clinch, Fitzhugh and all the Southern politicians discuss the question of slavery in the abstract? Do they not deliver long discourses to prove that slavery is right, just, benign, civilizing, and necessary? That it is the proper condition of the negro and working man? And is any true Northern man so poor a workman as to say that these men shall not be replied to? What! shall all the South be privileged to praise and applaud human slavery, and not even Charles Sumner be allowed to describe it as it really is.

Aye! as it really is! For after all the main question—the alpha and omega of the controversy—is this: Does he tell the truth about Slavery? This institution now claims to be national—to travel with the national flag—to be one of the specially cherished peculiarities of the nation. Therefore it concerns us all to know what it is. We in Pennsylvania have a right to discuss it, for it no longer confines itself to the slave states; it claims to be a national thing, and we are all concerned in what is national. In a word, the pertinent inquiry is, 'Does Charles Sumner speak true or false?' To the speech then. Does he not quote the law right? Are not his figures and calculations all correct? Is not his history true? Who can point out a single error in his facts or his argument? Why then single this speech out for obnoxious attack before you answer it? Thus far no one has answered it, and no one we presume will attempt to do so.

We are not Abolitionists; we do not agree with Charles Sumner's plan or method of abolition. We are sorry that the slavery question engenders so much heat and violence. But we are thoroughly sick and tired of that wretched, dogmatic, brutal slang which has its carresses and apologies for the 'slave master,' and only abuse and falsehood for those who believe in the Anti-Slavery doctrine of Jefferson and Washington.—*Philadelphia Sunday Transcript.*

LETTER FROM THADDEUS HYATT.

[Although the Senate has ordered the release of Mr. Hyatt, yet we give the following letter written to a friend in Cleveland, prior to the action of that body. It shows the spirit of the man.]

WASHINGTON, JUNE 25, 1860.

MY KIND FRIEND: Your very excellent and sympathizing letter of 22nd is before me. I thank you very heartily for giving me a place in your affections.

Whatever our Heavenly father prompts his children to do in this world will be right. He has gifted me with a woman's endurance and with a man's will to perpetuate the endurance. I do not suffer in health. I am as well off here as I should be anywhere. I do not care to go. I do not care to stay. If the cause of right and truth can be best promoted by my stay, not only am I willing, but I am sure it will be done. If the American people have so far relapsed from that spirit of liberty that *give precepts to Kings*, when their stern fathers stood for freedom, and made muskets speak for liberty, then it is high time that some man should stand in the Pillory of the Nation, and need be die; thus only can the human heart be reached, thus only can that agitation be initiated, which brings healing breezes over regions of misdeeds and death. The sympathy of friends is all I ask, not for my suffering, for I have none, but with me in the principle. To know that all the world are not dead is as much as I can ask or expect, though my faith would not fail if I were dead; because it is enough that God lives, I have no children. I have a wife. My means are ample. God has fitted me for this work. I am occupied at present in battling for the oppressed

who are unjustly incarcerated in this jail. I have a lawyer employed to contest the outrageous cases that are daily occurring. I have released three colored persons, and am 'carrying the war into Africa.'

God has put me in the right place; I am quite content. 'Why Massa,' said Old Bossy, 'spare to me de Lord has specially sent you here for the colored people?' Why, yes, Bossy, said I, the Lord, it seems, has put me in jail to get other people out! Bossy scratched his head very much puzzled in his Theology, but quite delighted with my success in getting him out. I am now about commencing actions on behalf of some of the wronged—actions for false imprisonment, and actions for violations of law otherwise. I think some of the little people, 'clothed in brief authority,' will by and by respect law if they do not humanity or justice.

The Slave Oligarchy will by and by lose their superlative 'Indifference.' They boast, I am told, that 'they do not know there is such a person in existence as the humble individual they inconsiderately eleven weeks ago.' When they find their fields being trampled down, and rooted up, perhaps they may condescend to look around and enquire after their Elephant.

Beal's employing counsel, I am studying Maryland law and the laws of the District as I wish to know the subject for myself.

But the mail will soon close and my letter is already long.

Ever thine,

THADDEUS HYATT.

THE SPEECH OF SENATOR SUMNER—HOW IT IS RECEIVED.

The great speech by Senator Sumner, delivered last week, we regret to say, is received by a large portion of the Republican press, with disapprobation. It is characterized, as 'ill timed,' 'ill advised,' 'too radical,' 'too severe,' &c., &c., and no Republican journal that we have yet seen, can find room for its insertion. The *New York Tribune*, turns upon it the cold shoulder, and makes disparaging remarks upon it. The *Cincinnati Gazette*, does the same, and the Republican journals, not a few, follow suit.

What does this mean? Is it an indication that the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country is coming down to a lower scale, under the influence of an abiding conservatism?

The indication is to us an unpleasant one. Immense masses of the people will share with us the surprise we feel, at this treatment of a great, eloquent, thorough, and masterly speech portraying the moral as well as political deformities of the sum of all villainies.

The people will certainly wish to see this speech so criticized, and so disparaged by a large and influential portion of the Republican press.

The speech is very long, but we feel it to be our duty, to give our readers, at length, an opportunity to judge for themselves, wherein this speech was unworthy of the man, the place, the occasion, or the times in which we live.—*Portage County Democrat.*

EXTRACTS FROM CHARLES SUMNER'S SPEECH.

When last I entered into this debate, it became my duty to expose the crime against Kansas, and to insist upon the immediate admission of that Territory as a State of this Union, with a constitution forbidding Slavery. Time has passed; but the question remains. Resuming the discussion precisely where I left it I am happy to avow that rule of moderation, which, it is said, may venture even to fix the boundaries of wisdom itself. I have no personal griefs to utter; only a barbarous egotism could intrude these into this chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge; only a barbarous nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened, and the tears that have been opened since I spoke, have their voices too, which I cannot fail to hear. Besides, what am I—what is any man among the living or among the dead compared with the question before us? It is this alone which I shall discuss, and I open the argument with that easy victory which is found in charity. The crime against Kansas stands forth in painful light. Search history and you cannot find its parallel. The slave trade is bad; but even this enormity is petty compared with that elaborate contrivance by which, in a Christian age and within the limits of a Republic, all forms of constitutional liberty were perverted; by which all the rights of human nature were violated, and the whole country was held trembling on the edge of civil war; while all this huge exuberance of wickedness, detestable in itself, becomes tenfold more detestable when its origin is traced to the madness for Slavery. The fatal partition between Freedom and Slavery, known as the Missouri Compromise; the subsequent overthrow of this partition, and the seizure of all by Slavery; the violation of plighted faith; the conspiracy to force Slavery at all hazards into Kansas; the successive invasions by which all security was destroyed, and the electoral franchise itself was trodden down; the sacrilegious seizure of the very polls, and through pretended forms of law, the imposition of a foreign Legislature upon this Territory; the acts of this Legislature, fortifying the usurpation, and among other things, establishing test oaths, calculated to disfranchise actual settlers, friendly to Freedom, and securing the privileges of the citizen to actual strangers friendly to Slavery; the whole crowned by a statute, 'the be-all and end-all' of the whole usurpation—through which Slavery was not only recognized as a complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but the brightest is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods, but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent, no middle passage, no change of time, no capture, no purchase money, no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible God-given franchise. And a Divine mandate, strong as that which guards life, guards liberty also. Even at the very morning of creation, when God said 'let

there be extension. Therefore, by logical necessity, must Slavery be discussed—not indirectly, timidly, and sparingly, but directly, openly, and thoroughly. It must be exhibited as it is, like in its influence and in its animating character, so that not only its outside but its inside may be seen. * *

On former occasions, I have discussed Slavery only incidentally; as, in unfolding the principle, that Slavery is sectional and Freedom national; in exposing the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave bill; in vindicating the prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory; in exhibiting the immensity throughout the jurisdiction of the Slave States, and especially of South Carolina; and lastly, in unmasking the crime against Kansas. On all these occasions, where I have spoken at length, I have said too little of the character of Slavery, partly because other topics were presented, and partly from a disinclination which I have always felt to press the argument against those whom I knew to have all the sensitiveness of a sick man. But, God be praised, this time has passed, and the debate is now lifted from details to principles. Grand debate has not occurred in our history; rarely in any history; nor can this debate close or subside except with the triumph of Freedom.

First assumption: Of course I begin with the assumption of fact. It was the often-quoted remark of John Wesley, who knew well how to use words, as also how to touch hearts, that 'Slavery was the sum of all villainies.' The phrase is pungent; but it would be rash in any of us to criticize the testimony of that illustrious founder of Methodism, whose ample experience of Slavery in Georgia and the Carolinas seems to have been all condensed in this sententious judgment. Language is feeble to express all the enormity of this institution, which is now venerated as in itself a form of civilization, 'enrolling' at least to the master, if not to the slave. Look at it in whatever light you will, and it is always the scab, the cancer, the 'bare bones,' and the shame of the country; wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apologists, but wrong in the concrete also, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principles, and it is nothing less than a huge insurrection against the eternal law of God, involving in its pretensions the denial of all human rights, and also the denial of that divine law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically the grossest lie and the grossest Atheism. Founded in violence, sustained only by violence, such a wrong must, by a sure law of compensation, blast the master as well as the slave; blast the lands on which they live; blast the community of which they are a part; blast the Government which does not forbid the outrage; and the longer it lasts, and the more completely it prevails, must its blasting influences penetrate the whole social system. Barbarous in origin; barbarous in its law; barbarous in all its pretensions; barbarous in the instruments it employs; barbarous in consequences; barbarous in spirit; barbarous wherever it shows itself. Slavery must breed barbarians, while it develops everywhere, alike in the individual and in the society of which he forms a part, the essential elements of barbarism. In this character it is now conspicuous before the world. In undertaking now to expose the barbarism of Slavery, the whole broad field is open before me. There is nothing in its character, its manifold wrong, its wretched results, and especially in its influence on the class who claim to be 'enrolled by it,' that will not fall naturally under consideration.

[After quoting the definitions of slavery as given by the slave code, Mr. Sumner says:]

Out of this definition, as from a solitary germ, which in its pettiness might be crushed by the hand, towers our Upas tree and all its gigastric poison. Study it, and you will comprehend the whole monstrous growth.

Sir! look at its plain import, and see the relation which it establishes. The slave is held simply for the use of his master, to whose behest his life, liberty and happiness are devoted, and by whom he may be battered, teased, mortgaged, leached, sold, or executed, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming table on the hazard of a card or a die; all according to law. Nor is there anything within the limit of law, indicated on a bench which may not be inflicted on the slave. He may be marked like a hog, branded like a cow, yoked like an ox, hobbled like a horse, driven like a man, sheared like a sheep, maimed like a cripple, and constantly beaten like a brute; all according to law. And should life itself be taken, what is the remedy? The law of Slavery, limiting that rule of evidence which, in barbarous days and barbarous countries, prevented a Christian from testifying against a Mahomedan, openly pronounces the incompetency of the whole African race—whether bond or free—to testify in any case against a white man, and, thus having already surrendered the slave to all possible outrage, crowns its tyranny by excluding the very testimony by which the bloody cruelty of the slave master might be exposed. Thus in its law does Slavery paint itself; but it is only when we look at details and detect its essential elements—see in number—also inspired by a single motive, that its character becomes completely manifest.

Foremost, of course, in these elements, is the impossible pretension, where barbarism is lost in impunity, by which man claims property in man.—Against such arrogance the argument is brief.—According to the laws of nature, written by the same hand that placed the planets in their orbits, and like them constituting a part of the eternal system of the universe, every human being has a complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but the brightest is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods, but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent, no middle passage, no change of time, no capture, no purchase money, no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible God-given franchise. And a Divine mandate, strong as that which guards life, guards liberty also. Even at the very morning of creation, when God said 'let